ENDORSED San Francisco County Superior Court

APR 18 2007

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk BY: JOCELYN C. ROQUE Deputy Clerk

CGC-05-441008

-{PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

(OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)

WILLIAM VERICK (BAR NO. 140972) FREDRIC EVENSON (BAR NO 198059) 2 KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER 424 First Street 3 Eureka, California 95501 DAVID H. WILLIAMS (BAR NO. 144479). BRIAN ACREE (BAR NO. 202505) 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 Oakland, California 94610 6 Telephone: (510) 271-0827 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 10 11 MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE 12 FOUNDATION, 13 Plaintiff, 14 ٧. OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC., et al. 15 16 Defendant. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.): ODMA\PCDOCS\PORTLAND\555180\2 Page 1 Mateel v. Ore. Sci

CASE NO. 441008

28

1 INTRODUCTION On or about January 31, 2005, the Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation 2 1.1 ("MEJF") and its attorneys, Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") sent a 60 Day Notice 3 Letter (Exhibit A) to the Office of the California Attorney General of the State of California 4 ("California Attorney General"), all California counties' District Attorneys and all City Attorneys 5 of California cities with populations exceeding 750,000, (collectively, "Public Enforcers"), 6 charging certain businesses with violating the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 7 1986, California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), in their manufacture, distribution and/or sale of wires and cables coated with polyvinyl chloride ("PVC"). 9 Specifically, MEJF charged that persons handling the PVC-coated wires and cables were exposed 10 to certain chemicals, listed under Proposition 65, including acrylonitrile, antimony trioxide, 11 arsenic, 1,3 butadiene, carbon tetrachloride, carbon black extracts, chlorinated paraffins, 12 chloroform, ethyl acrylate, ethylene thiourea, nichel, toluene, cadmium, hexavalent compounds of 13 chromium, vinyl chloride, lead and lead compounds, lead acetate, lead phosphate, lead subacetate 14 and di(2ethylhexyl) phthalate (hereafter "Proposition 65 Chemicals.") 15 On or about October 7, 2005, MEJF ("Plaintiff"), acting on behalf of itself, the 16 1.2 public interest, and the general public with respect to any Proposition 65 and other claims related 17 to the Covered products, including those described in the Notice Letter, filed a Complaint for 18 civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in the San Francisco Superior Court, fashioned, 19 MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION v. OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC., et al., 20 Case No. CGC-05-441008. The Complaint alleged, among other things, that OREGON 21 SCIENTIFIC, INC. ("Settling Defendant") violated Proposition 65 by manufacturing, marketing 22 and/or distributing to California residents products that are themselves or which incorporate wires 23 and cables that are PVC-coated and failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings to California 24 residents who handle and use such products that the handling and use of those products in their 25 normally intended manner will cause those persons to be exposed to Proposition 65 Chemicals. 26 Plaintiff and Settling Defendant are, for purposes of this Consent Judgment, 1.3 collectively referred to as the "Parties," with each of them a "Party". CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMA\PCDOCS\PORTLAND\5555180\2

Mateel v. Ore. Sci CASE NO. 441008

27

28

Page 2

1 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered Products" means any 1.4 2 and all products that are or have been manufactured, distributed, marketed or sold by the Settling 3 Defendant, and that are themselves, or that incorporate, utilize, or have appended to them any 4 type of Cords, including but not limited to cords used for power, earphones, or mouses, as well as 5 products that are in the future to be manufactured, distributed, marketed or sold by the Settling 6 Defendant consistent with the provisions of this Consent Judgment. The term "Covered 7 Products" also includes products which are or are in the future to be manufactured, distributed, 8 marketed and/or sold by the Settling Defendant either under its own name or brand or under the 9 name or brand of another (e.g., privately labeled products). 10 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Settling Defendant" shall 11 include the Settling Defendant, as defined above, and its past, present, and future parents, 12 divisions, subdivisions, brands, subsidiaries and affiliates and the predecessors, successors, and 13 assigns of any of them, as well as their past, present, and future officers, directors, employees, 14 agents, attorneys, representatives, shareholders and assigns. The term Settling Defendant shall also be deemed to include the Settling Defendant's supplier of Covered Products, but only with 15 16 respect to those Covered Products that such supplier manufactures for the Settling Defendant. A 17 list delineating some, but not necessarily all, of the names of the various business entities and 18 brands or product types referred to in this Paragraph and in existence on or before the date of this 19 Consent Judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit C. 20 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Settling Defendant admits that: 1.6 21 (a) it is a business that employs more than ten persons and manufactures, distributes and/or sells 22 Covered Products into the State of California; (b) the Covered Products may contain or may have 23 in the past contained one or more Proposition 65 Chemicals; and (c) Proposition 65 Chemicals are 24 chemicals listed under Proposition 65 as being known to the State of California to cause cancer 25 and/or reproductive toxicity. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court 1.7 has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaints and personal jurisdiction over the Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaints, that venue is CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMA\PCDOCS\PORTLAND\5555180\2

Mateel v. Ore. Sci CASE NO. 441008

26

27

28

Page 3

- 1 proper in the County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent
- 2 Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaints and
- 3 Notice Letters and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity
- 4 based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein, arising therefrom or
- 5 related thereto.
- 6 1.8 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement
- 7 of any and all claims between the Parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This
- 8 Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the
- 9 Complaints, each and every allegation of which the Settling Defendant denies; nor may this
- 10 Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct,
- 11 culpability or liability on the part of any Settling Defendant. The Settling Defendant maintains
- 12 that its Covered Products have at all times complied with all applicable laws, including
- 13 Proposition 65.

14 2. <u>SETTLEMENT PAYMENT</u>

- 15 2.1 In settlement of all of the claims referred to in this Consent Judgment against the
- 16 Settling Defendant:
- 17 (a) The Settling Defendant shall pay, within fifteen (15) days of entry of this
- 18 Consent Judgment, a total of \$18,500 (eighteen thousand five hundred dollars). The payments
- required by the preceding sentence shall be made payable as follows: (i) sixteen thousand dollars
- 20 (\$16,000) shall be paid to KELC for attorneys fees and costs incurred by KELC on behalf of
- 21 Plaintiff in investigating this matter and negotiating this Consent Judgment on behalf of itself and
- 22 the general public, (ii) two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500) shall be made payable to
- 23 Californians for Alternatives to Toxics.
- 24 2.2 MEJF and KELC represent and warrant that each of the organizations identified in
- 25 Paragraph 2.1(a)(ii) above is a tax exempt, section 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and that
- funds distributed to these organizations pursuant to this Consent Judgment may only be spent to
- 27 reduce harm from toxic chemicals, or to increase consumer, worker and community awareness of
- health hazards posed by lead and other toxic chemicals.

Page 4 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMA\PCDUCS\PORTLAND\5555180\2

Mateel v. Ore. Sci

CASE NO. 441008

2.3 Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, each side shall bear its own costs and attorney's fees.

3. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

3

6

28

The Parties request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment and waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.

4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

7 As to Covered Products, this Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution 4.1 8 between the Settling Defendant and Plaintiff, acting on behalf of itself regarding claims described 9 in the Notice Letter and/or the Complaint in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety 10 Code Section 25249.7(d) of: (a) any violation of Proposition 65; or, (b) with respect to exposures 11 to the Proposition 65 Chemicals associated with the use of Covered Products, any other statutory 12 or common law Claim, to the fullest extent that any such claims were or could have been asserted 13 by any person or entity against the Settling Defendant based on its or their exposure of persons to 14 chemicals Contained in or otherwise associated with the use of Covered Products manufactured, 15 sold or distributed by, for or on behalf of the Settling Defendant and/or their alleged failure to 16 provide a Clear and reasonable warning of such exposure to such individuals; or (c) as to 17 exposures to chemicals contained in or otherwise associated with the use of Covered Products, 18 any other claim based in whole or part on the facts alleged in the Complaints or Notice Letters, 19 whether based on actions or omissions committed by the Settling Defendant or any other entity 20 with the Settling Defendant's chain of distribution, including, but not limited to, customers, 21 wholesale or retail sellers or distributors and any other person in the course of doing business 22 ("Downstream Entity"). Plaintiffs certify that they and their consultants have made a diligent 23 search for Proposition 65 Chemicals that could be found in PVC cords, and that none of the 24 chemicals listed by the State of California pursuant to Section 25249.8 of the California Health 25 and Safety Code (other than those listed in the notice letter) have been found or are likely to be 26 found in PVC cords at levels that would require a warning under Health & Safety Code 27 section 25249.6.

Page 5 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMA\PCDOCS\PORTLAND\5555180\2

Mateel v. Ore. Sci
CASE NO. 441008

1	4.2 As to Covered Products, this Consent Judgment is also a final and binding		
2	resolution between the Settling Defendant and Plaintiff, of all claims, statutory or common law,		
3	known or unknown, to the fullest extent that any such claims were or could have been asserted by		
4	plaintiff as of the date of this Consent Judgment.		
5	4.3 As to any claims, violations (except violations of this Consent Judgment), actions,		
6	damages, costs, penalties, or causes of action which may arise or have arisen after the original		
. 7	date of entry of this Consent Judgment, compliance by the Settling Defendant with the terms of		
8	this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute its full and complete compliance with		
9	Proposition 65 with respect to the provision of warnings for chemicals contained in or otherwise		
10	associated with the use of Covered Products, provided that, with respect to lead concentrations,		
11	the Settling Defendant complies with Section 7.1 below, and that, with respect to concentrations		
12	of chemicals other than lead, those concentrations do not significantly and materially increase		
13	after the date this Consent Judgment is entered.		
14	Notwithstanding Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 above, as to all customers, distributors,		
15	wholesalers, retailers or any other Downstream Entity, except as otherwise indicated in		
16	Section 4.5 below, which may in the course of doing business use, maintain, distribute, or sell		
17	Covered Products which are manufactured, distributed or sold by the Settling Defendant		
18	(including Covered Products which are privately labeled by the Settling Defendant for a		
19	Downstream Entity), Plaintiff (acting on behalf of itself and, as to those matters described in		
20	Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 on behalf of the general public) waives all rights to institute any form of		
21	legal action whether under Proposition 65 or otherwise, arising out of or resulting from or related		
22	directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, exposure to, or otherwise associated with the use of		
23	and alleged failure to warn with respect to Proposition 65 Chemicals contained in Covered		
24	Products.		
25	4.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to require an out of state		
26	manufacturer of Covered Products to provide a Proposition 65 warning for occupational		
27	exposures occurring within the State of California. Nothing in this Consent Judgment will be		
28	deemed to release a California employer from liability for failure to comply with its obligations, Page 6 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::UDMAIPCDOCS\PORTLAND\555180\2		
	Mateel v. Ore. Sci CASE NO. 441008		

1	if any, to provide warnings under Proposition 65 for the exposures of its employees to chemicals		
2	contained in or otherwise associated with Non-Retail Covered Products unless such employer		
3			
4			
5	4.6 In furtherance of the foregoing, Plaintiff hereby waives any and all rights and		
6	benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it by virtue of the provisions		
7	of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:		
8	A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS		
9	WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE		
10	RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE		
11	DEBTOR.		
12	Plaintiff understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of its waiver of		
13	California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if Plaintiff and/or, with respect to the matters		
14	raised in the Notice Letters and/or in this litigation, including any person or entity on whose		
15	behalf they purport to act or could act, suffers future damages or harm arising out of, resulting		
16	from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the matters covered in Sections 4.1,		
17	4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 above ("Damages"), Plaintiff and any person or entity on whose behalf they		
18	purport to act or could act, will not be able to make any claim for such Damages against the		
19	Settling Defendant or any of its customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other		
20	person in the course of doing business who may use, maintain, distribute or sell the Covered		
21	Products. Furthermore, Plaintiff acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such		
22	Damages which may exist as of the date of this release but which Plaintiff does not know exist,		
23	and which, if known, would materially affect its decision to enter into this Consent Judgment,		
24	regardless of whether its lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error,		
25	negligence, or any other cause, no matter how justifiable such cause may be.		
26	4.7 The Settling Defendant waives all rights to institute any form of legal action		
27	against Plaintiff, its officers, directors, attorneys, consultants and representatives for all legal		
28	Page 7 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::UDMA\PCDOCS\PORTLAND\555180\2		

Mateel v. Ore. Sci CASE NO. 441008 actions undertaken or statements made in the course of such legal actions to seek enforcement of this action and judgment.

5 ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

- The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties
- 5 hereto by means of noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of San
- 6 Francisco County.

3

7 6 MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 8 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the Parties and
- 9 upon entry of a modified amended Consent Judgment by the Court, or upon motion of any Party
- as provided by law and upon entry of a modified amended Consent Judgment by the Court.
- Notwithstanding the immediately preceding sentence or any other term or provision of this
- 12 Consent Judgment, if Plaintiff or any affiliated entity, or the California Attorney General, enters
- into, or agrees to in writing, or is otherwise bound by injunctive relief terms or provisions relating
- to the provision of Proposition 65 warnings for Covered Products, with regard to their Cords,
- which, taken together, are more favorable to the Settling Defendants than the terms or provisions
- 16 that this Consent Judgment provide for a Covered Product of like kind and characteristics with
- 17 respect to its thermoset/thermoplastic-coated electrical cord and use, the terms of injunctive relief
- provided for in Section 7 of this Consent Judgment shall automatically be deemed to have been
- modified to add such more favorable terms or provisions as an option which the Settling
- 20 Defendant may elect for compliance with this Consent Judgment.

21 7 **INJUNCTION**

- 7.1 Covered Products shall be deemed to comply with Proposition 65 and be exempt
- from any Proposition 65 warning requirements if the Cords that are sold as a part of or in
- association with those Covered Products meet the following criteria: (a) the surface contact layer
- of the Cords shall have no lead as an intentionally added constituent; and (b) the surface contact
- layer of the Cords shall have lead content by weight of no more than 0.03% (300 parts per
- 27 million, or "300 ppm"). The Settling Defendant may comply with the above requirements by
- relying on information obtained from its suppliers regarding the content of the surface contact Page 8 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMANPUDUCSNPORTLANDISSSIBUZ

Mateel v. Ore. Sci

CASE NO. 441008

- layer of the Cords, provided such reliance is in good faith. Obtaining test results showing that the
- 2 lead content is no more than 0.03%, using a method of sufficient sensitivity to establish a limit of
- 3 quantification (as distinguished from detection) of less than 300 ppm shall be deemed to establish
- 4 good faith reliance. Provided that the level of quantitation requirement set forth in the preceding
- 5 sentence is met, the test protocol and methods described on Exhibit D hereto may be relied on.
- 6 Nothing in the preceding two sentences shall preclude a Settling Defendant from establishing
- 7 good faith reliance by an alternative means. Samples of the type of material used in the
- 8 manufacture of Defendant's Covered Products have been tested by Plaintiff and found to meet the
- 9 reformulation requirement specified in this paragraph.
- The terms of this Section 7 shall not apply to customers of the Settling Defendant
- and other downstream entities that may, in the course of doing business, sell or distribute the
- 12 Covered Products. Covered Products manufactured and shipped for distribution to or sale in
- 13 California by the Settling Defendant shall meet the warning exemption standard set forth in
- 14 Section 7.1 of this Consent Judgment.

8 DISPUTE RESOLUTION

15

- 16 8.1 Wherever this Consent Judgment provides that the Settling Defendant may invoke
- 17 the Dispute Resolution process or file a motion to have the Court resolve an issue, the Settling
- Defendant seeking a resolution shall first mail (by certified mail) and fax a notice to Plaintiff,
- setting forth the dispute and the basis for the Settling Defendant's position. The Parties
- interested in the dispute shall then meet and confer in good faith within sixty (60) days to
- determine whether the dispute may be resolved in order to avoid further litigation of the issue,
- 22 unless both Parties waive, in writing, notice and the opportunity to meet and confer. In the event
- 23 that Plaintiff fails to meet and confer within the sixty (60) day period, the Settling Defendant's
- position shall be deemed to have prevailed. In the event that, after meeting and conferring,
- 25 Plaintiff disapproves or disagrees with a position taken by the Settling Defendant, Plaintiff shall
- 26 notify the Settling Defendant in writing, sent by an overnight delivery service requiring a
- signature upon delivery, within 14 (fourteen) days of meeting and conferring. Should the Plaintiff
- do so and should the Settling Defendant wish to pursue its position, the Settling Defendant shall Page o CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)..ODMANGCDOCONFORTLAND/555100/2 Mateel v. Ore. Sci

CASE NO. 441008

- 1 then seek to have the California Attorney General concur with the Settling Defendant's position.
- 2 If the California Attorney General concurs in writing with the Settling Defendant, the Settling
- 3 Defendant shall provide notice thereof to Plaintiff and the Settling Defendant's view shall prevail.
- 4 If, however, the California Attorney General does not concur with the Settling Defendant within
- 5 ninety (90) days of the date on which the Settling Defendant sought the California Attorney
- 6 General's concurrence, the Settling Defendant shall have the right to bring the issue to the Court
- 7 by noticed motion for its de novo review and, provided that it is proceeding in good faith, shall
- 8 not be subject to further penalties during the pendancy of such motion and/or if the motion is not
- 9 contested by Plaintiff.

10 9. **TERMINATION**

- The Settling Defendant may elect (but is not required) to terminate its participation in this
- 12 Consent Judgment beginning on June 31, 2007 or any date thereafter by means of filing with
- 13 the Court and serving on the Plaintiff, the California Attorney General, and counsel of record to
- 14 the Settling Defendant with a notice of termination. In the event of the exercise of such an
- election, the Settling Defendant's obligations and rights and benefits hereunder shall immediately
- 16 be deemed to cease to exist.

17 10. APPLICATION OF JUDGMENT

- The obligations of this Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon all plaintiffs,
- acting in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), and the
- 20 Settling Defendant and the successors or assigns of any of them.

21 11. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE

- Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the
- 23 Party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of the
- Party represented and legally to bind that Party.

25 12. **NOTICES**

28

- Whenever a notice is called for by this Consent Judgment, it shall be provided to the
- 27 Settling Defendant at the addresses identified in Exhibit B hereto. If any Party desires to change

Page 10 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMA/PCDOCS/PORTLAND/55518092
Mateel v. Ore. Sci
CASE NO. 441008

	·
1	the individual and/or address designated to receive notice on its behalf, such Party shall provide
. 2	notice to all other Parties pursuant to the terms of this Section.
3	13. <u>RETENTION OF JURISDICTION</u>
4	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement this Consent Judgment.
5	14. ENTIRE AGREEMENT
6	This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the
7	Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions,
8	negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or
9	otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party
10	hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be
11	deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties.
12	15. GOVERNING LAW
13	The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by
14	the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of
15	California law.
16	16. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>
17	If this Consent Judgment is not approved and entered by the Court, or if the entry of this
18	Consent Judgment is successfully challenged, this Consent Judgment shall be of no force or
19	effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose. Provided, however, that if another
20	court finds any term of provision of this Consent Judgment or the application thereof to any
21	person or circumstance to any extent to be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Consent
22	Judgment and the application of such term or provision to persons or circumstances other than
23	those as to which it is held invalid or unenforceable shall not be affected thereby, and each
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	term or provision of this Consent Judgment	shall be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent
2	permitted by law.	
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	·
4	DATED: 5/1/0/	
5	- 1	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION
6		and War wallerich
7		By: William Verick
8		
9	DATED: Februsy 15,200/	
10		OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.
11		By: !lelle!
12		Its: Director
13	THE CO. ORDERD	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: APR 1 8 2007	FATRICK J. MAHONEY,
15		JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
16	•	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	•	
23	• .	·
24		·
25		
26		
27		
28		
	Page 12 CONSENT JUDGMENT (OREC	GON SCIENTIFIC, INC.)::ODMA/PCDOCS/PORTLAND/555180/2

Mateel v. Ore. Sci CASE NO. 441008

1	EXHIBIT A
2	(Copy Of 60-Day Notice Letter)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28



January 31, 2005

EDWARD G. WEIL
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. BOX 70550
OAKLAND CA 94612-0550

ATTORNEY GENERAL COPY CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODE §1040

Greetings:

This office and the Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation ("Mateel") hereby give you notice that the private businesses on the attached service list are in violation of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6. This office and Mateel are both private enforcers of Proposition 65, both organizations may be reached at the below listed address and telephone number, I may be considered a "responsible individual" at both organizations, and I may be contacted at the same address and telephone number. The above referenced violations occur when California residents come into contact with thermoset/ thermoplastic-coated wires, cables, and/or cords/cord sets, including PVC-coated wires, cords/cord sets, plugs and connectors, and both SPT and HPN cords/cord sets (hereinafter collectively "Cords"). These businesses market products with, or that are themselves, Cords. Some examples of the products that incorporate Cords are those listed in the attached Product List. Handling of, and contact with, these Cords exposes people to acrylonitrile, antimony trioxide, arsenic, 1,3 butadiene, carbon tetrachloride, carbon black extracts, chlorinated paraffins, chloroform, ethyl acrylate, ethylene thiourea, nickel, toluene, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, vinyl chloride, lead and lead compounds, lead acetate, lead phosphate, lead subacetate, and di(2ethylhexyl) phthalate. Handling Cords causes these chemicals to come off the coating of the Cords and to be transferred to the skin of the person handling the Cords. These chemicals are then ingested through hand-to-mouth contact and hand-to-food-to-mouth and hand-to-cigarette-tomouth behavior. These chemicals are also absorbed through the skin, through mucous membranes and enter the body through cuts, punctures and abrasions. Smokers also inhale those chemicals transferred from hands to cigarettes. People are thus exposed to these chemicals via the ingestion, inhalation, dermal absorption, mucous membrane absorption and subcutaneous routes. These exposures (and resulting violations) occur occupationally, environmentally, and as the result of the sale of consumer products and services. In occupational settings, the type of work that is done during which the above-referenced exposures occur is the handling of, and contact with, Cords, including during the manufacture, installation, maintenance, handling and/or use of electrical equipment to which these Cords are attached. As described above, the exposures that are the subject of this notice occur via the dermal absorption, inhalation, ingestion and subcutaneous routes. These violations have occurred every day since at least January 31, 2004 and will continue every day until reasonable warnings are given to those people exposed. Environmental exposure violations occur in every county of the State and occur both on and off the property of the aforementioned private businesses.

Cordially,

William Verick

Exhibit A Page 1 of 4

SERVICE LIST

EDWARD G. WEIL
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL
P.O. BOX 70550
OAKLAND CA 94612-0550

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF OAKLAND 505 NTH ST 12TH FLOOR OAKLAND, CA 94612

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO CITY HALL ROOM 206 400 YAN NESS SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF SACRAMENTO 980 9°, Sured, 10° Floor SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF SAN JOSE 151 W. MISSION ST. SAN JOSE, CA 95110

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
200 N. MAIN ST.
LOS ANGELES CA 90017

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF SAN DIEGO '202 C ST. FLOOR J SAN DIEGO. CA 92101

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 225 FALLON ST, 89 OAKLAND, CA 94612

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT 'ATTORNEY COUNTY OF ALPINE P.O. SOX 248 MARKLEEVILLE, CA 96120

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY CDUNTY OF AMADOR 108 COURT ST.-SUITE 202 JACKSON, CA 95642

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF BUTTE 25 COUNTY CENTER DR OROVILLE, CA 95965

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF CALAVERAS COVERNMENT CENTER 891 MOUNTAIN RANCH ROAD SAN ANDREAS, CA95249

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF COLUSA 547 MARKET ST. COLUSA, CA 95932

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA P.O. BOX 610 MARTINEZ. CA 94553

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF DEL NORTE 450 H ST 4171 . CRESCENT CITY. CA 95531

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF EL DORADO 515 MAIN ST. PLACERVILLE, CA 93667

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF FRESNO 2220 TULARE ST #1000 FRESNO. CA 93771 OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF GLENN P.O. BOX 430 WILLOWS, CA 95988

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT 825 5TH ST. EUREKA, CA 95501

OUNTY OF IMPERIAL COURTHOUSE, FLOOR 2 939 W. MAIN ST EL CENTRO. CA 92743

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF INYO P.O. DRAWER D INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF KERN 1215 TRUXTUN AVE. FLOOR 4 BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF KINGS 1400 W. LACEY BLVD. HANFORD, CA 93Z30

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF LAKE 255 N. FORBES ST # 424 LAKEPORT, CA 95453

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF LASSEN
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING
707 NEVADA ST.
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 18000 CAMINAL COURTS BUILDING 210 W. TEMPLE ST. LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MADERA 109 W. YOSEMITE AVE. MADERA, CA 93637;

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MARIN HALL OF JUSTICE #183 SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MARIPOSA P.O. BOX 748 MARIPOSA, CA 95338

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MENDOCINO 101 S. STATE ST. UKIAH. CA 95457

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MERCED 2222 M ST. MERCED, CA 95340

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MODOC P.O. BOX 1171 ALTURAS, CA 9610

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MONO P.O. BOX 617 BRIDGEPORT, CA 93517 OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF MONTEREY
240 CHURCH ST.
P.O. BOX 180
SALINAS, CA, 93902

COUNTY OF NAPA 931 PARKWAY MALL P.O. BOX 720 NAPA, CA 94559-0720

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF NEVADA COURTHOUSE ANNEX NEVADA CITY, CA 95959

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF ORANGE 400 CIVIC CENTER DR WEST SANTA ANA, CA 92701

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF PLACER 11562 B AVE AUBURN, CA 95601-2687

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF PLUMAS P.O. BOX 10716 QUINCY, CA 95971

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 4075 MAIN ST. RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO P.O. BOX 749. SACRAMENTO, CA 95804

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF SAN BENITO
419 4TH ST
HOLLISTER, CA 95021

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO 116 MT. VIEW AVE. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0004

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 101 W. BROADWAY #1440 SAN DIEGO. CA 92101

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 850 BRYANT ST \$132 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94101

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN' 221 E. WEBER AVE #202 STOCKTON, CA 95202

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER #450 SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93408

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN MATEO HALL OF JUSTICE AND RECORDS REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA 1105 SANTA BARBARA ST. SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA 70 W. HEDDING ST. SAN JOSE, CA 95110

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ 701 OCEAN ST. #200 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SHASTA 1525 COURT ST. REDDING, CA 96001

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SIERRA P.O. BOX 457 DOWNIEVELE, CA 95936 OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SISKIYOU P.O. BOX 986 YREKA, CA 96097

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SOLAND 600 UNION AVE FAIRFIELD. CA 94513

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SONOMA 600 ADMINISTRATION DR. #2121 SANTA ROSA, CA 95403

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF STANISLAUS 1100 I ST. #200 MODESTO, CA 95354

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SUTTER 1160 CIVIC CENTER BLVD. NA YUBA CITY, CA 95993

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF TEHAMA P.O. BOX 519 REDBLIFF, CA 96080

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF TRINITY P.O. BOX 310 WEAVERVILLE, CA 96093

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF TULARE COUNTHOUSE #224 VISALIA, CA 93291

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE 2 S. GREEN ST. SONORA, CA 95370

VENTURA COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE c/s GREGORY BROSE D.D.A. 4245 MARKET ST. #205 VENTURA, CA 93003

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF YOLO 204 4TH ST P.O. BOX 1247 WOODLAND, CA 95693

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF YUBA 215 STH ST. MARYSVILLE, CA 95901

CUTHISIT PRAPAVAT, PRESIDENT A I WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTIORS, INC. 6925 PARAMOUNT BLVD LONG BEACH, CA 90805

RICHARD KRONRAD, PRESIDENT ATICO INTERNATIONAL USA, INC. 501 S. ANDREWS AVE. FT. LAUDERDALE, FL. 13301

MARK COHEN, PRESIDENT ATLAS COPCO NORTH AMERICA, INC. 14 MAPLE AVE, POB 2028 PINE BROOK, NI 07058

IIM CHASM, PRESIDENT CLORE AUTOMOTIVE, L.L.C. 8735 ROSEHILL RD., STE. 220 LENAXA, KS 66215

DANIEL G. FLAHERTY, PRESIDENT GEMMY INDUSTRIES CORPORATION 2111 WALNUT HILL LANE IRVING TX 70518

DOUGLAS NEGRIN, PRESIDENT INTERDYNAMICS, INC. 10 J9TH ST. BROOKLYN, NY 11232

J. MARTY O'DONOHUE, PRESIDENT MARINCO 2655 NAPA VALLEY CORPORATE DR NAPA, CA 94558-7453

PRESIDENT OR CEO MILWAUKEE ELECTRIC TOOL CORP. 13135 W. LISBON RD

KEITH W. BENSON, PRESIDENT NATIONAL MANUFACTURING C ONE FRST ST STERLING IL 61081

PAUL ZIMMERMAN, PRESIDENT OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC. 19861 SW 95TH PL TUALATIN, OR 97062

DARLENE L GOSS, PRESIDENT PACIFIC INDUSTRIAL COMPONE INC. 2545 PRAIRIE RD

EUGENE, OR 97402

BRADLEY M. NYSETHER, PRESU SEA-DOG 3402 SMITH AVE: PO BOX 479 EVERETT, WA 98201

FRANK FRENCH, PRESIDENT SHIPN FU COMPANY OF AMERIC 10939 N. POMONA AVE KANSAS CITY, MO 64153

PATRICIA SCHOENBERG, PRESII SPECTRA MERCHANDISING . INTERNATIONAL, INC. 4210 NORMANDY CHICAGO, IL. 60614

LOUIS I SHATKIN, PRESIDENT TOWER MANUFACTURING CORI 25 RESERVOIR AVE PROVIDENCE, RI 02907

DENNIS JACOBSEN, PRESIDENT WMH TOOL GROUP 2420 VANTAGE RD ELGIN, IL 60121

> Exhibit A Page 2 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

I, William Verick, hereby declare: This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice(s) in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notices have violated Health. and Safety Code section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings. I am the attorney for the noticing party. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the action. Based on the information obtained through those consultations, and on all other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiffs' case can be established and the information did not prove that the alleged violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the person(s) consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: January 31, 2005

This notice alleges the violation of Proposition 65 with respect to occupational exposures governed by the California State Plan for Occupational Safety and Health. The State Plan incorporates the provisions of Proposition 65, as approved by Federal OSHA on June 6, 1997. This approval specifically placed certain conditions on Proposition 65, including that it does not apply to the conduct of manufacturers occurring outside the State of California. The approval also provides that an employer may use the means of compliances in the general hazard communication requirements to comply with Proposition 65. It also requires that supplemental enforcement is subject to the supervision of the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Accordingly, any settlement, civil complaint, or substantive court orders in this matter must be submitted to the Attorney General.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Alison Nichols, declare:

If called, I could and would testify as follows: I am over eighteen. My business address is 424 First Street, Eureka, California, 95501. On January 31, 2005, I caused the attached 60-DAY NOTICE LETTER, or a letter identical in substance, to be served by U.S. Mail on those public enforcement agencies listed on the attached SERVICE LIST; in addition on the same date and by U.S. Mail I caused the attached 60-DAY NOTICE LETTER and PROPOSITION 65: A SUMMARY to be sent by Certified U.S. Mail to the private business entities also listed on the attached SERVICE LIST. I deposited copies of these documents in envelopes, postage pre-paid, with the U.S. Postal Service on the day on which the mail is collected. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on January 31, 2005, at Eureka, California.

ALISON/NICHOLS

Exhibit A

Page 3 of 4

PRODUCT LIST

COMPANY NAME	PRODUCT
	PIT BULL PIG TAIL MALE TWIST TO FEMALE
A J WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTORS, INC.	GROUND ITEM #CHIE002
ATICO INTERNATIONAL USA, INC.	TDE SYSTEMS LAMINATOR MOPS#345540-116
CLORE AUTOMOTIVE, L.L.C.	SOLAR 1 AMP BATTERY CHARGER PART NO. 1001
	TOTALLY GHOUL PUMPKIN LIGHT DEPT 09 9-4
GEMMY INDUSTRIES CORPORATION	CODE 0-579657-115
	INTERDYNAMICS POWERAIR AIR COMPRESSOR
INTERDYNAMICS, INC.	MODEL# PA-120 OR #PA-120T
	MARINCO POWER CORD MARINE CORD SET 25FT
MARINCO	PRODICT #25PCM2
MILWAUKEE ELECTRIC TOOL CORP. /	
ATLAS COPCO NORTH AMERICA, INC.	MILWAUKEE SUPERCHARGER II #48-59-0192
	DYNAMAXX 40 WATT GLUE GUN #N315-820 OR
NATIONAL MANUFACTURING CO	#V5564
OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC.	EMERGENCY ALERT WEATHER RADIO #WR106
	PICO 6-12 VOLT TEST LIGHT #0690PT
PACIFIC INDUSTRIAL COMPONENTS, INC.	PICO 30 INCH TEST LEADS #1575PT
THE TO THE CONTROLL COMPONENTS, INC.	SEA-DOG LINE POWER SOCKET WITH BATTERY
SEA-DOG	CLIPS #426450-1
	ROAD X PEDITION CORDLESS SPOTLIGHT MODEL
SHINN FU COMPANY OF AMERICA, INC.	#I-5001
SPECTRA MERCHANDING	SPECTRA DIGITAL AM/FM STEREO CASSETTE
INTERNATIONAL, INC.	PLAYER #SCR-90
	OVERLOAD GUARD EXTENSION CORD 40FT
TOWER MANUFACTURING CORP	#C629166
	TURTLE WAX 6INCH RANDOM ORBIT
WMH TOOL GROUP	WAXER/POLISHER #65000TW
	1 Caron Caronacte noodoo 111

1	
2	EXHIBIT B (Address For Notice Under Consent Judgment)
3	
4	Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation c/o Brian Acree
5	370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5
6	Oakland, CA 94610
7	Oregon Scientific, Inc. Attention: Julie Hui
8	19861 SW 95th Avenue Tualatin, OR 97062
9	
10	With a copy to:
11	John J. Dunbar Ball Janik LLP
12	101 SW Main Street, Suite 1100 Portland, OR 97204
13	1 Ortiand, Ort 7/204
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	EXHIBIT C
2	(Optional List of Certain Brand Names and Product Type)
3	PRODUCT TYPES
4	Clocks, including but not limited to Projection Clocks, Wall Clocks and Alarm Clocks
5	Emergency Weather Radios
6	Public Alert Monitors and Radios
7	Weather Monitoring Stations, including but not limited to Barometers, Hygrometers, Thermometers, Rain Gauges and Wind Speed/Direction Monitors
9	
	Digital Still and Video Cameras
10 11	Multimedia Audio/Video Players/Recorders, including but not limited to MP3/ MP4 Players and Audio/Video CD/DVD Players and Systems
12	Loudspeakers
13	Accessories for Apple Computer Inc.'s "iPod" products
14	Electronic Learning Laptops
15	Electronic Interactive Books and Games
16	•
17	Electronic Interactive Globes
18	Telecommunications and Radiocommunications Devices, including but not limited to corded and cordless telephones, GPS navigation devices, transceivers and marine radios
19	These products are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Oregon Scientific, Inc.
20	and/or Oregon Scientific Global Distribution Limited.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	EXHIBIT D		
2	(Non-Binding Exemplar of Optional Testing Protocol)		
3	This non-binding examplar provides examples of testing protocol that could be used to test cable samples. These are not the only methods that may be used in		
4		any testing.	
5			
6	Alternativ	<u>vely</u> :	
7	Cables m	ay be tested using the following method.	
8 9	Step 1:	Cut 3-inch section of a cable that has not previously been used or wiped.	
10	Step 2.	On multiconductor cables, remove the insulated conductors and any other inner components from the 3-inch section of the cable. On	
11		single insulated conductors, remove the metallic conductor from the 3-inch section of the cable. Place the other nonmetallic covering into a	
12		lead free receptacle (such as a pre-labeled resealable plastic food	
13		storage bag).	
14	Step. 3.	Repeat steps 1 and 2 above for two additional cables such that a total of three samples are produced for laboratory analysis.	
15 16	Step 4.	Prepare samples for laboratory analysis according to USEPA Method 160.4 or 3050. Lab notes MUST indicate that PVC sample was	
17		completely dissolved prior to analysis.	
18	Step 5.	Analyze samples for total lead by USEPA Method 7420 (AA Flame), USEPA 6010, or the most current USEPA method used by most laboratories.	
19	Stan 6		
20	Step 6.	Compute the arithmetic mean for the three samples.	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	Alternatively:	
2	Cables may also be analyzed using ED-XRF technology, and by compu	iting the
3	arithmetic mean for the three samples used.	
4	Alternatively:	
5	Cables may be analyzed by stripping the surface of the cable and analy surface of the material, not the entire cable, using the appropriate USE	zing only the PA Methods
6	identified above, and by computing the arithmetic mean for the three sa	imples used.
7		T. T
8	Testing by the Settling Defendant, as defined by Section 1 of the Conse required by the Consent Judgment.	nt Juagment, is not
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14 .		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	,	
22		
23		
24		
25		,
26		
27		
28		

WILLIAM VERICK, CSB #140972 Klamath Environmental Law Center FREDRIC EVENSON, CSB #198059 424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501 (707) 268-8900 FILED San Francisco County Superior Court APR 18 2007
DAVID H. WILLIAMS, CSB #144479 BRIAN ACREE, CSB #202505 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Facsimile: (510) 271-0829 Attorneys for Plaintiff
MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION, Plaintiff, Proposed ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT VS.
OREGON SCIENTIFIC, INC., et al., Date: April 17, 2007 Time: 9:30 a.m. Dept. No.: 302 Defendants.
Plaintiff's motion for approval of settlement and entry of Consent Judgment as to defendant Oregon Scientific, Inc. was heard on regular noticed motion on December 18, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Department No. 302. Having reviewed the pleadings and the moving papers, having reviewed the terms of the proposed consent judgment and having considered the arguments of counsel, the Court finds as follows:

ORDER Approving Settlement (Oregon Scientific, Inc.) Mateel v. Oregon Scientific, Inc., Case No. 441008

- 1. The warnings and reformulation the Consent Judgment requires comply with the requirements of Proposition 65.
- 2. The payments in lieu of civil penalties specified in the Consent Judgment are reasonable and conform to the criteria of Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b)(2).
- 3. The attorneys fees awarded under the Consent Judgment and the underlying hourly rates, time expended, and costs incurred are reasonable.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

APR 1 8 2007 Dated:

PATRICK J. MAHONEY

Judge of the Superior Court